

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 8-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 8-15 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al.

Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to claim 15 for having the language “reeling carnage” in addition to the elements of claim 18, which include a “slice” and a “supporting surface.” The Examiner’s rejection is hereby traversed. In claim 15, the reeling carriage (33) is a device different from the slide 95. The reeling carriage’s purpose is to move the reel (R) on the slide, as is shown in Figs. 4b and 4c. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 8-15 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these statements.

The claimed invention relates to a reel-up of a web having a reeling means for guiding a web (W) onto a reel spool (11) to thereby form a reel. The reel-up of the present invention also contains

a slide (4) having a supporting surface (44) structured and arranged to retain a reel spool (11) thereon. The slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5), whereby the supporting surface (44) is movable from a functional vicinity of the reeling means (5) to a vicinity of the bearing surface of the supporting structure (2). The claimed invention also relates to a method for reeling a paper web with a reel-up around a reel spool (R).

Independent claims 8 and 18 require that the slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5).

The references cited in the Office Action do not disclose the apparatus arrangement in accordance with the claimed invention. The prior art references do not disclose a slide having a supporting surface (44) wherein the slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5).

The Examiner contends that Thomas et al. shows a reeling means (19) and a slide (5) having a supporting surface structured and arranged to retain a reel spool thereon, wherein the supporting surface is slidably movable. (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner equates the transport device 5 of Thomas et al. with the slide 4 of the present invention and the drum 19 of Thomas et al. with the reeling device 5 of the present invention.

In Thomas, the slide (5) cannot be structurally distinct and detached from the reeling means (19), because the reeling means (19) are placed above the slide (5) and are always moved with the

slide (5). In addition, the slide (5) is not independently movable relative to the reeling means (19), because if the slide (5) is moved, then the reeling means (19) are to be kept stationary, then they must be moved in a direction opposite to the direction of movement of the slide (5). The operation does not correspond to what is normally meant with the term independent.

Therefore, independent claims 8 and 18 are allowable. Dependent claims 9-17 and 19-24 depend on independent claims 8 and 18 and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Thomas et al. does not anticipate or teach the present invention and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/720,228
Amdt. Dated November 18, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 19, 2003

989.1020

This Amendment is believed to be timely filed. If a petition for extension of time and/or any other fees are required, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: 

Martin G. Raskin
Reg. No. 25,642

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800